

Remarks

Claim 1 is rejected as obvious over the Takizawa reference in view of the Nishio reference. The Takizawa reference is newly cited. Takizawa is cited for a foamed magnetic roller and Nishio is cited for a roller having a smooth surface.

Takizawa briefly mentions magnetic powder (col. 4, line 34) and briefly mentions the conductive layer may be foam (col. 4, line 47). Foam is mentioned in Takizawa in the context of being soft (“elastomer or foam material”, col. 4, line 47). Such brief teaching directed to a soft roller in no way suggests a roller having a limited amount of foam located internally so as to have unimpaired magnetic properties.

The Official Action cites the Nishio abstract for teaching a smooth surface of the roller. However, the Nishio abstract is to a toner carrier having no teaching of the roller having magnetic properties. More fundamentally, the Nishio abstract teaches that very small bubbles on the surface are an alternative. Accordingly, the Nishio abstract is all about keeping toner from entering the roller and has no logical relationship to a magnetic roller.

To exclude foamed rollers in general having some magnetic material, claim 1 is amended to be limited to up to 12 percent of the weight of such a roller being reduced by the foam. Specific support will be found at page 11, line 13 of the specification. This further defines the limited amount of the foam. Clearly, nothing in the references is at all specific to such a limit on the amount of foam.


Claims 2-10 are rejected on the basis of the rejection of claim 1 and further in view of the Ochiai reference. Ochiai is cited for the specific proportions of magnet material to binder and for the specific type of material. With regard to claims 5-6, Ochiai is cited for the use of nylon-6. With regard to claim 8, Ochiai is cited for the addition of carbon to the binder.

In response, however, Ochiai discloses a roller which is not foamed at all. Such a teaching could not supply the deficiencies of Takizawa and Nishio as discussed above.

Accordingly, reconsideration is due course is respectfully requested, followed by allowance of claims 1-10, all of the pending claims.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael John Dixon et al.


John A. Brady, Reg. No 22,020
Attorney for Applicants
Lexmark International, Inc.
Intellectual Property Law Dept.
740 W. New Circle Road
Lexington, KY 40550
(859) 232-4785